

A4634

CONGRESSIONAL RECORD — APPENDIX

July 23

MOST AREAS GET EXCITING VIEW OF SUN
SPECTACULAR

(By John F. O'Brien)

BAR HARBOR, MAINE.—The shadow of the Moon streaked across central Maine Saturday in a total eclipse of the Sun viewed clearly by thousands gathered in this seaside resort. Skies over central Maine cleared just before the shadow swept out of the northwest, through Canada to Maine and out to the Atlantic Ocean. The time of total eclipse was 5:44 p.m. e.d.t.

SHADOW RACES

About 1,000 persons perched atop this area's best vantage point, 1,532-foot-high Cadillac Mountain, first saw the gray shadow in the distance as it approached over the rugged central Maine mountains.

Then, at the moment of totality, the mountaintop was plunged into darkness, one of nature's rarest spectacles.

The eclipse itself provided a breathtaking view. At the moment of totality where the Sun had been there was only a cold gray white light. Stars were perfectly visible in the sky.

Observers on the mountaintop were almost speechless. One man said, "It was fantastic. It's a sight I'd wait years to see."

The faint light that was visible just before and just after totality was cold and eerie. A chill swept across the mountaintop as the temperature dropped in 25 minutes from 76° to 68°.

BOOM IN SKY

Just as totality ended there was a sharp boom in the sky which startled observers. Scientists said it may have been an Air Force jet fighter, racing through the sky with the eclipse, had cracked the sound barrier.

Thousands of visitors vied with scientists and each other for vantage points to watch the phenomena that turns day into night.

The 60-mile-wide belt of pitch blackness—totality—extended from Japan and across Alaska, Canada and central Maine.

The moment of totality here was 5:42 p.m. e.d.t.

Cadillac Mountain, highest Atlantic seaboard elevation in the United States, swarmed with scientists and sightseers. Telescopes, cameras, spectrophotometers, and other sensitive equipment poked snouts skyward.

SKY IS LIMIT

The sky was the limit for the once-in-a-lifetime thrill of watching the rare celestial show which the prophets once said signaled the end of the world.

An estimated 100,000 tourists jammed coastal and central Maine. The State figured they paid nearly \$10 million in extra highway tolls, sales taxes, and food and lodging to watch the sky spectacular.

While various groups of scientists gazed up at the heavens, others were watching the effects of the eclipse on fish, insects, and wildlife.

Astronomers hoped to fathom some of the mysteries of nature and eventually to apply that knowledge to life in the space age.

Scientists were particularly curious about the shimmering Bailey's Beads, visible only a few minutes before, during, and immediately after totality. These are flashes of sunlight shining through the Moon's mountains and valleys.

HEAVY GEAR

Other scientists lugged heavy equipment up the mountain to study the Sun's corona or halo and to measure airglow.

Each expedition was allocated a roped-off area on the mountain patrolled by 42 uniformed rangers. A 6-mile road goes to the plateau-like summit covered with scrub growth.

Senator Goldwater's Reckless Foreign
Policy

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. MORRIS K. UDALL

OF ARIZONA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, July 23, 1963

Mr. UDALL. Mr. Speaker, this may be hard for my colleagues to believe, but there are just a few Arizonians who do not subscribe to all the well-publicized views of our junior Senator, Mr. GOLDWATER. One Arizonian who thinks for himself is William R. Mathews, editor and publisher of the Arizona Daily Star in Tucson. Last Tuesday, July 16, Mr. Mathews took issue with Senator GOLDWATER's recent pronouncements on the subject of foreign policy. I believe my colleagues will find it of interest. The editorial follows:

SENATOR GOLDWATER'S RECKLESS FOREIGN
POLICY

When Senator BARRY GOLDWATER, before a nationwide conservative meeting in Washington, criticized President Kennedy because he has determined definitely to live in coexistence with the Soviet Union, GOLDWATER went way off base into a field of reckless foreign policy.

Since the Soviet Union was founded in 1917 we have been living in coexistence with it. It is the period since 1945 that has seen the political power of the world polarize into the two poles of the Soviet Union and the United States. Whereas, before 1945 political power had been dispersed widely among the former great powers of Britain, France, Germany, Italy, Japan, the United States, and the Soviet Union, both political and military power today is concentrated in the hands of the two giants.

They live in coexistence. Those Americans who oppose such a situation, and insist it should be ended, in effect demand that we Americans destroy the Soviet Union, which can only be done by a gigantic nuclear war. They assume also that Americans would win this war, although it would mean the loss maybe of one-third to one-half of our population. They also assume that should we be victorious, that peace and security would come, which is not necessarily true. To assume that the destruction of the Soviet Union would destroy communism is just about as mistaken as to say that the Roman conquest of Jerusalem, and its destruction in 92 A.D., destroyed Christianity.

Moreover, even if their country is badly destroyed, the Russians will recover. They are an unusually sturdy people, who since 1914 have survived all kinds of destruction, only to rise again. So it would be again. The Soviet Union, or a strictly Russian Government, would rise again, and become strong.

We Americans should not forget that for more than a century the British and French—in later years Germany also—sought to curb Russian imperialism in its attempt to move south. Today we have that job, as our 6th Fleet in the Mediterranean indicates. It is there for just one purpose: to contain Soviet imperialism, and so we can live in coexistence with the Soviet Union.

That is what all of our other armaments are about. They have only one main objective: to enable us to live in coexistence with the Soviet Union. They have been built up, because, after we nearly disarmed after World War II, the Russians took advantage

of such military weakness to establish themselves in what are today their eastern satellites. They tried to take over Turkey, Greece, Iran, and Korea. They tried to squeeze us out of Berlin. Not until we reluctantly fought back, were such moves stopped, although what they have done in Cuba is significant.

The policy of coexistence has paid off, when it was backed by both force and political determination to contain the spread of Soviet Communist imperialism. When it was not backed by those two factors, the Soviets moved in as they did in Cuba.

President Eisenhower, a Republican, established that blindly stupid Cuban policy. President Kennedy inherited it. Eventually we will have to get the Soviets out of Cuba, even though it will take force. But when it is done, it will not bring on a worldwide nuclear war.

Senator GOLDWATER has overlooked too many of these factors that have made coexistence a successful diplomatic policy. The only alternative to it, assuming we back it with all our might and power so as to prevent further encroachments, is preventive war, in which we strike the first blow in a gigantic surprise attack on the Soviet Union.

Are the Republicans going to nominate and elect a President who favors such a reckless war policy?

Senator GOLDWATER is being most unjust to identify that policy with conservatism. It is hard to believe that conservatives throughout the country will endorse it.

A Foreign Service Academy

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. MARTHA W. GRIFFITHS

OF MICHIGAN

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, July 23, 1963

Mrs. GRIFFITHS. Mr. Speaker, it is a pleasure for me to insert a letter written by one of my constituents expressing his views on a Foreign Service Academy:

DETROIT, MICH.,

July 12, 1963.

HON. MARTHA W. GRIFFITHS,
House of Representatives,
Washington, D.C.

DEAR REPRESENTATIVE GRIFFITHS: I have several misgivings about the superficially desirable proposal for a Foreign Service Academy. In the first place, the proposed academy is conceived of as an agency for manufacturing specially trained people rather than as an institution of education. This is the same philosophy that makes the presently operating academies—notably the military academies—unacademic and largely antiacademic. Narrow training designed for an immediate and specialized end seldom provides the experience needed to think imaginatively about unforeseen nontextbook problems. The military academies are slowly recognizing the shortcomings of narrow vocational education. Is the philosophy of the proposed Foreign Service Academy not just as narrow?

Secondly, the proposed academy will presumably be a major and especially prestigious supplier of diplomats and lesser Foreign Service personnel. Is it desirable to have a large percentage of our diplomats coming from a single intellectual environment? Even large universities often find whole departments on intellectual fads which,

1963

CON

while perhaps desirable to have some diplomats acquainted with, should not be a common way of thinking for any large percentage of the Foreign Service.

Thirdly, it is hard to imagine how a Government academy could develop any tradition of critical intellectual analysis of present and past foreign policy. How could a Foreign Service Academy free itself from crank accusations that it is not sufficiently doctrinaire in its methods? Michigan's State universities cannot seem to escape intimidation from simplistic rightwing legislators. What would happen if a Communist scholar lectured on campus? Indeed, what would Senator DIRKSEN say if Professor Rostow lectured?

Fourth, the security investigations that would be made of the faculty and the students would reduce the academy to peddling safe ideas. This kind of policy would undoubtedly be forced on the academy as it was forced on the Peace Corps. Its sterilizing effects are well known.

The professional quality of our Foreign Service obviously needs improvement. The problem, I suggest, is not that our country lacks people whose education qualifies them as diplomats and foreign policy makers. The difficulty is that many of these competent people cannot afford to enter or stay in the Foreign Service. Money invested in providing realistic expense allowances for diplomats would open the diplomatic corps to many who cannot now afford this kind of job. To the extent that there is a deficiency in particular skills (such as languages), the Government can make certain that the humanities programs of regular academic institutions can provide these skills. In this regard, Congress might expand the National Defense Education Act to the humanities—not in a narrowly vocational manner as the National Defense Education Act now operates for the physical sciences at the expense of the nonmilitary biological sciences—but in a broad program to stimulate education in all areas.

Respectfully,

JOHN F. I
Contracted